

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

Claim 1 has been amended to clearly recite that the pump is down in the well, and a new claim 16 has been added that is of generally the same scope as amended claim 1, but using somewhat different terminology.

In the main cited reference, applicant's own US 5,470,052 there is no suggestion to pump out a well with a pump down the well, much less one equipped (see claim 12) with a drill. The huge advantage is that the pump is much more efficient when it is placed right at the site where it needs to evacuate fluid. This is clearly novel over the cited art.

Thus the 102 rejection is overcome. Since there is no suggestion in the art to put a pump down a well to prepare it for abandonment, a §103 is also out of the question.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

/Andrew Wilford/

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

06 August 2008
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure:

None.